DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 023 749 UD 006 452

By-Braund, Robert A.; And Others

Compensatory Education in California, 1966-67. Summary of the Annual Evaluation Report.

California State Dept. of Education, Sacramento.
Pub Date 68
Note-34p.
EDRS Price MF-$0.25 HC-$1.80
Descriptors-Achievement Gains, *Annual Reports, *Compensatory Education, *Disadvantaged Youth, Educational Finance, Educational Needs, *Federal Programs, Handicapped Students, Migrant Child Education, Objectives, Program Effectiveness, *Program Evaluation, Reading Improvement, Self Concept, Student Attitudes, Test Results, Verbal Ability
Identifiers-California, Elementary and Secondary Education Act, ESEA TITLE 1, McAteer Act

The required annual report on compensatory programs funded by the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, Title I, describes California's efforts in the first full year of operation. In general, the programs sought to raise reading and verbal performance levels, improve performance as measured by achievement tests, and also improve students' attitudes toward school and about themselves. Because of Congressional mandate, some of the funds were specifically earmarked for migrant children, youth in state and local institutions, and mentally ill and mentally retarded children. Findings, based on various measures, show that pupil achievement rate increased, with gains as high as three years. The achievement gap between advantaged and disadvantaged students seems to be narrowing. The most progress occurred in districts with the most comprehensive program focusing on a few selected goals. The major problems encountered were reduced appropriations and delays in funding, lack of qualified personnel, and misunderstanding about the purposes of Title I. (NH)

0645 2—E

Summary of the
Annual Evaluation Report

Compensatory Education In California 1966-67

UD 006 452 ED023749

CALIFORNIA STATE DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Max Rafferty—Superintendent of Public Instruction
Sacramento 1968

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

Summary of the Annual Evaluation Report

Compensatory Education In California 1966-67

A Report Based on Projects Conducted Under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, Title I

Prepared by the

Bureau of Evaluation and Research
Office of Compensatory Education
California State Department of Education

UD 006 452

PREFACE

An annual evaluation of California's compensatory education program under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, Title I, is required by federal legislation and by the state McAteer Act of 1965. The State Office of Compensatory Education has the responsibility of evaluating and disseminating information to school districts and other interested parties on the results of activities designed to strengthen the educational program for children from disadvantaged backgrounds.

California's ESEA Title I program was initiated in the spring of 1966. This report contains an evaluation of the program during the 1966-67 school year, the first full year of operation. Most of the Title I activities were operated by school districts for disadvantaged children regularly enrolled in school. Specialized programs were also implemented for children of migrant agricultural workers, handicapped children in state schools and hospitals and neglected and delinquent children in state and local institutions.

Major responsibility for the preparation of the state report was assumed by Robert A. Braund, Alexander I. Law, J. Vincent Madden, Hubert Reeves and Gerald S. Rider, consultants in the Bureau of Evaluation and Research; and Ralph D. Benner, consultant in the Bureau of Community Services.

Wilson C. Riles, Director
Office of Compensatory Education

Thomas A. Shellhammer, Chief
Bureau of Evaluation and Research,
Office of Compensatory Education

CALIFORNIA STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION

Dorman L. Commons, President

Milton L. Schwartz, Vice-President

Mrs. Talcott Bates

Daniel A. Collins, D.D.S.

Howard Day

Thomas G. Harward, M.D.

Bishop Gerald Kennedy

Mrs. Seymour Mathiesen

Miguel Montes, D.D.S.

Ben N. Scott

CALIFORNIA STATE ADVISORY COMPENSATORY EDUCATION COMMISSION

Joseph D. Lohman, Chairman

Mrs. Andrew Billingsley

James Dardis

Dr. Robert L. Docter

Sam Hamerman

Mrs. David Joseph

Honorable Milton Marks

Zane Meckler

Alfred W. Newman

Dr. Henry Paul, M.D.

Isadore Pivnick

Dr. Octavio I. Romano, V

Honorable Leo J. Ryan

Miss Irene Tovar

Dr. William Stockard

CONTENTS

	Page
Preface	iii
Introduction	1
Objectives and Activities	5
Evaluation Methods	7
Findings	9
Reading	12
Guidance and Counseling	15
Inservice Training	15
Teacher Aides	17
English as a Second Language (ESL)	18
Preschool	18
Integration	19
Health Services	20
Cultural Enrichment	21
Progress Ratings	22
Migrant Education	23
Problem Areas	27
Reduction in Appropriation and Delay in Funding	27
Lack of Personnel	28
Misunderstanding of Title I Philosophy	29

INTRODUCTION

The goal of compensatory education is to enhance the educational attainment of children from poverty backgrounds. Compensatory education recognizes that if every child is to receive an equal opportunity to succeed to the full extent of his potential, the schools must give special attention to children who have educational needs that cannot be met by the regular instructional program.

Children from lower socio-economic backgrounds generally do not come to school as prepared for successful learning as do their more advantaged classmates. The disadvantaged child does not have the verbal and language skills which form the basis of classroom instruction. He is likely to lack many of the cultural, social and educational experiences common to children of his age group. His parents generally have a low educational background and are unfamiliar with the educational process. He may be in poor health and may lack adequate nutrition.

This combination of factors often results in the disadvantaged child developing a poor self-image and a lack of educational aspiration that further impedes his learning progress. Past evidence based on test scores in reading indicated that the average child from a poverty background gained approximately 0.7 of a year's growth per school year. Thus he tended to fall farther and farther behind his middle class schoolmates as he progressed through the grades.

The Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, Title I, is California's major source of funds for compensatory education. The Act authorized federal funds to strengthen educational programs for economically, socially and culturally disadvantaged children. Title I was first

implemented in the spring semester of 1965-66, and the 1966-67 school year marked its first full year of operation.

California's allocation under ESEA Title I for 1966-67 was $73.6 million, as compared to $78.5 million in 1965-66. New amendments passed by Congress in 1966 earmarked part of the state's allocation for educational programs serving children of migrant agricultural workers, and neglected and delinquent youths in state and local institutions. Mentally ill and mentally retarded children in state hospitals and state schools were also provided additional services through Title I.

When funds for programs for specialized categories of disadvantaged children were subtracted from the state's total Title I allocation, the amount available for school district programs in 1966-67 was $70.7 million, with 938 districts participating. Funds were allocated to school districts according to the number of children from families that met the low income criteria.

While the funds available for school district programs decreased, the number of students eligible and participating increased from 289,382 in 1965-66 to 372,146 in 1966-67. Therefore, the amount of Title I funds approved per student dropped from $252 in 1965-66 to $190 in 1966-67.

Title I programs served disadvantaged public and non-public school students of all ages, ranging from youngsters who had not yet entered kindergarten to teenagers who had already dropped out of high school. Table A shows the grade-by-grade distribution of Title I participants. About two-thirds of the students were in the elementary grades.

TABLE A

NUMBER OF STUDENTS PARTICIPATING IN TITLE I PROGRAMS 1966-67

Grade	Public	Non-Public	Total	% Public	% Non-Public
P	5,296	218	5,514	96.04	3.95
K	28,739	56	28,795	99.80	.19
1	40,485	1,417	41,902	96.61	3.38
2	40,489	1,785	42,274	95.77	4.22
3	36,343	1,730	38,073	95.45	4.54
4	30,277	1,836	32,116	94.28	5.71
5	28,658	1,502	30,160	95.01	4.98
6	27,539	1,225	28,764	95.74	4.25
7	24,797	1,757	26,554	93.38	6.61
8	22,535	1,512	24,047	93.71	6.28
9	23,262	528	23,790	97.78	2.21
10	19,258	909	20,167	95.49	4.50
11	15,780	836	16,616	94.96	5.03
12	12,548	829	13,377	93.80	6.19
Total	356,006	16,140	372,146	95.66	4.33

TABLE B

DISTRIBUTION OF TYPES AND FREQUENCY
OF ESEA TITLE I ACTIVITIES 1966-67

Type of Activity	Primary Activity # of Act.	Primary Activity % of Act.	Secondary Activity # of Act.	Secondary Activity % of Act.	Tertiary Activity # of Act.	Tertiary Activity % of Act.
Curriculum Programs	640	57.2	188	23.4	76	14.3
Reduction of Teacher Load	90	8.0	90	11.2	70	13.2
Cultural Enrichment	71	6.3	79	9.8	48	9.0
Guidance and Counseling	60	5.3	103	12.8	60	11.3
Supportive Aux. Services	55	4.9	77	9.6	47	8.8
Preschool	40	3.5	38	4.7	27	5.0
Inservice Education	39	3.4	47	5.8	49	9.2
Study Centers and Tutoring	30	2.6	20	2.4	16	3.0
Attitude Development	29	2.5	69	8.6	44	8.3
Health Services	20	1.7	35	4.3	37	6.9
School-Community Coordination	15	1.3	13	1.6	14	2.6
Attendance Imp.	11	.9	17	2.1	17	3.2
Miscellaneous	6	.5	6	.7	12	2.2
Dropout Projects	5	.4	4	.4	5	.9
Summer School	3	.2	15	1.8	4	.7
Intergroup Relations	2	.1	1	.1	3	.5

OBJECTIVES AND ACTIVITIES

Each district determined its objectives from the particular educational needs of disadvantaged children in its schools. Activities were developed to implement the objectives. The most frequent objectives of California's Title I projects, stated in general terms, were:

- Improve classroom performance in reading beyond usual expectation.
- Improve performance as measured by standardized achievement tests.
- Improve the verbal functioning level of the children.
- Improve the children's attitudes toward school and education.
- Improve the children's self-image.

The categories of activities and their frequency as the primary, secondary or tertiary activity of school district projects conducted under Title I in 1966-67 are shown in Table B. As the categories of primary, secondary and tertiary are mutually exclusive, adding the percents of the three categories would be misleading. Secondary and tertiary activities were implemented, in most cases, to support the objectives of the primary activity.

For example, a district's project may have had as its major objective the improvement of reading skills. Its primary activity would be reading instruction which falls in the curriculum programs category. Recognizing that one cause of its students' reading problems might be impaired eyesight and hearing, the district hired personnel for vision and audiometric screening. Health services would be the district's secondary activity. In addition, the project may have included study trips to broaden the students' backgrounds and employment of teacher aides to enable the teacher to work more intensively with individual students. Reduction of teacher load and cultural

enrichment would be designated as tertiary activities of the project.

The activities were identified by projects and not by districts. Some districts operated several projects, with each of these having a primary activity and perhaps supporting activities. Another district conducting the same activities, but under one project, may have had only one primary activity and several secondary and tertiary activites. Table B is based on 1,118 projects implemented by 702 districts.

The majority of the primary activities were curriculum programs directed toward raising achievement in subject skill areas. The most frequent curriculum programs were in the areas of reading and basic communication skills. Other activities in the curriculum programs category, but conducted less frequently, were English as a Second Language, social sciences, science, mathematics and a comprehensive curriculum comprising more than one subject area.

Second in order of emphasis as a primary activity was reduction of teacher load, which accounted for eight percent of the projects. The most prevalent method of reducing teacher load was employment of teacher aides, followed by the addition of elementary grade teachers. Other categories accounting for more than five percent of the primary activities were cultural enrichment and guidance and counseling.

A comparison between 1966-67 and 1965-66 activities indicates a shift in emphasis between the two years. Curriculum programs, which constituted 47.2 percent of the 1965-66 projects, increased by 10 percentage points as the primary activity. Cultural enrichment and auxiliary services -- which included library services, physical education, special education and speech therapy -- decreased in emphasis as primary activities. Reduction

of teacher load, which comprised 23.4 percent of the secondary activities in 1965-66, accounted for only 11.2 percent of the secondary activities in 1966-67. Part of the decrease could be attributed to the 1966 amendments to the McAteer Act of 1965, which made available state funds for reducing pupil-teacher ratio in urban school districts.

To implement their Title I activities, school districts increased their staffs by 20,174 persons, of which about 6,500 were volunteers. The largest increase in employed personnel was in the category of teacher aides, with 4,274 hired on a full time or part time basis. Elementary school teachers comprised the next largest group of new employees. The number of positions supported by Title I during 1966-67 is shown in Table C.

State guidelines require that school districts establish advisory committees for Title I to insure community involvement in programs for disadvantaged children. A total of 7,577 persons served on school district advisory committees during 1966-67. Of the committee members, 5,012 were residents of the target area, and 2,869 of these were parents of disadvantaged children participating in Title I activities.

EVALUATION METHODS

Standardized achievement tests were used by most districts to evaluate the effectiveness of their Title I projects in meeting the stated objectives. This reflects the emphasis of the projects on raising student achievement level. Teacher observations were the second most frequently used evaluation technique. The 10 most common evaluation methods are shown in Table D. Six of the top 10 ranked devices were objective in measurement, while the remaining four were subjective.

TABLE C

NUMBER OF POSITIONS SUPPORTED
BY ESEA TITLE I FUNDS
1966-67

Positions	Full Time	More Than Half-Time Less than Full-Time	Half-Time or Less	Total
Teaching				
Teacher - Pre-kindergarten	207	30	60	297
Teacher - Kindergarten	111	4	20	135
Teacher - Remedial Reading	985	71	261	1,317
Speech Correctionist	29	7	30	66
Teacher of the Handicapped	42	3	37	82
Elementary Teacher	633	112	1,003	1,748
Secondary Teacher	624	68	275	967
Other Teaching Assignments not listed above	205	41	570	816
Total Teaching	2,836	336	2,256	5,428
Non-Teaching				
Teacher Aide	1,412	934	1,928	4,274
Librarian	140	26	92	258
Supervisor or Administrator	170	33	289	492
Counselor	268	16	124	408
Psychologist	54	12	112	178
Testing Assignment	20	2	34	56
Social work assignment	50	11	27	88
Attendance Assignment	42	5	22	69
Nurse	115	25	118	258
Dental Hygienist	4	1	10	15
Clerical Position	754	116	349	1,219
Volunteer	81	113	6,350	6,544
Other	252	37	598	887
Total Non-Teaching	3,362	1,331	10,053	14,746
GRAND TOTAL	6,198	1,667	12,309	20,174

TABLE D

TYPES OF EVALUATION DEVICES
USED MOST FREQUENTLY TO ASSESS PROJECT ACTIVITIES
1966-67

Type	Percentage of Projects
Standardized Achievement Tests	58.4
Teacher Observations	11.8
Questionnaires to Teachers	6.6
Anecdotal Records	6.0
Other Published Tests	5.2
Pupil Count	3.5
Locally Constructed Achievement Tests	3.4
Ability Tests	1.8
Questionnaire to Students	1.7
Local Attitude Scales	1.5

FINDINGS

In practically all cases, the achievement rate of students in Title I programs increased as measured by objective tests. The range of gains was substantial. Relatively few districts reported average gains of less than a month for every month of instruction, while in some districts the average was almost three years' gain during the year. In rare instances, the growth exceeded four years in special tutorial programs with highly individualized instruction.

The majority of the gains can be classified as significantly more than the one month's growth per month of instruction that the students averaged during the brief operation of Title I in 1965-66. Thus, the achievement gap that has traditionally existed between the disadvantaged student and the middle class student appears to be gradually closing. Title I students increased in percentile rank on standardized achievement tests, although the majority still fall in the first quartile.

An analysis of the evaluation data submitted by school districts leads to certain conclusions:

- The greatest progress in achievement was observed in districts, schools and grade levels that had the most comprehensive compensatory education programs concentrated on a few selected objectives. Projects which attempted through a single activity -- such as field trips or arts and crafts -- to overcome the learning problems caused by poverty usually failed to result in demonstrable achievement gains.

The majority of the Title I programs were comprehensive in nature, with the primary activities concentrated in skill development areas, usually reading or language development. Supportive activities of successful programs included diagnosis of individual student learning difficulties, counseling and guidance, inservice training of staff personnel and efforts to increase parent involvement in the educational process.

A frequent element of successful comprehensive programs was a reduced pupil-teacher ratio, usually accomplished by employment of

teacher aides. However, programs which consisted solely of reduced teacher load or class size -- without additional services or specialized instruction -- were generally not as effective in raising student achievement as were the comprehensive programs.

- Achievement gains tended to be greatest in the elementary grades, especially in grades one through five. The least amount of growth was at the high school level, where some of the districts reported gains of less than one month per month of instruction. Generally, the elementary students tended to receive more saturated Title I services than did the secondary students. Also, increments of growth are more easily measured and observed in the elementary grades than in the secondary grades.
- Greatest gains, on the average, were recorded in medium sized urban areas, and the least demonstrated gains were in the rural areas. Medium sized urban districts, which had Title I allocations large enough to support a comprehensive compensatory education program but had smaller concentrations of disadvantaged students with less severe educational problems than did the largest districts, averaged about two months' growth for every month of instruction. The largest districts' average was about a month's growth per month of instruction.

The rural districts, on the other hand, tended to have smaller allocations with disadvantaged students spread over a larger geographical area. These districts generally spent less per Title I student, indicating an effort to reach more children with a less comprehensive program. Rural districts also tended to lack the

specialized personnel to implement or evaluate a comprehensive program. While rural districts reported positive change by their students, usually in grades one through five, in most cases the objective data submitted by the districts were inadequate to determine the specific magnitude of growth.

- In addition to increased student achievement, most districts reported that students in Title I programs improved in attitudes toward school, motivation in learning and self-confidence. These factors were often reflected in an increase in school attendance and a decrease in dropout rate and behavioral problems.

Following are descriptions of some of the Title I activities and services.

Reading. Title I students usually scored higher gains in vocabulary or word recognition skills than in paragraph meaning. Some districts made comparisons of gains of students from varying income backgrounds within the target areas. Children from the lowest income group in the target area schools made greater gains in vocabulary than in paragraph meaning, while the reverse was true of students from relatively higher income families within the target area.

Students with the most severe reading disabilities among the disadvantaged students in the target area were selected for remedial reading instruction. These students were usually a year or more behind the reading level of their disadvantaged classmates, which meant they were even further behind when compared to the general student population.

The most frequent organizational system for remedial reading was

use of a special reading teacher who worked with a team in a reading laboratory to diagnose and remedy individual learning deficiences. Almost 57 percent of the reading projects used this system. Other frequent procedures were employment of teacher aides to assist regular classroom teachers during reading instruction and employment of additional classroom teachers to reduce class size. Many districts used more than one organizational system or modified the structure to account for variations in reading needs of students. For example, some districts used reading specialists for students with severe reading disabilities, while teacher aides were provided for the regular teachers to assist students with less severe problems.

An analysis of the most effective reading projects showed that they involved a substantially higher expenditure per student than the average for the state. Characteristics of the projects in which students with severe reading disabilities showed the greatest achievement gains were:

- Students received reading instruction from a remedial reading specialist. Some projects also included the use of an aide to assist the remedial reading specialist.
- The organizational system included extensive diagnostic services to identify causes of reading and/or learning deficiencies and specify remediation techniques. Some districts also developed case conference techniques using a variety of specialists to determine the causes of reading and/or learning difficulties. Case conferences included recommendations and observations from the nurse, reading specialist, classroom teacher, counselor, teacher aide and school psychologist.

- The pupil-teacher ratio during remedial reading instruction was five to one or smaller.
- The organizational system provided for frequent communication between the reading specialist and the classroom teacher to discuss individual student progress.
- The organizational system used more than one instructional method for remedial reading. A pragmatic approach to reading instruction was adopted. The focus was on finding methods or techniques which were successful with each individual student. Districts reported success in using a variety of instructional methods, including phonics training, creative writing, language experience stories and linguistic approaches.
- The student received instruction in a room specifically organized for remedial reading instruction. The reading laboratory, also called a language laboratory or reading clinic, contained a wide variety of mechanical and printed devices which enabled the individual student to proceed at his own pace in remediation of a specific deficiency. Immediate assistance from an aide or a reading specialist was available when the student was not successful.

In summary, the key to reading improvement for students with severe reading disabilities was a flexible instructional system conducted by a reading specialist working closely with the classroom teacher. The instructional system contained enough individualized instruction and specialized materials to guarantee daily success and continued improvement by each student.

Guidance and Counseling. Guidance and counseling activities were aimed primarily at improving student attitudes, raising educational and occupational aspirations, improving school-parent relationships and diagnosing student learning problems. In most cases guidance and counseling was a supportive activity to a curriculum program.

Individual counseling was the most frequent procedure, followed by psychological testing. Parent and group counseling were also conducted in Title I programs. Among the trends was increased use of social workers for home visits and counselors at the elementary and junior high school level.

The most effective counseling procedures were multiple counseling sessions, in which the counselor met with the student regularly over a substantial period of time, usually more than one semester. Other characteristics of effective counseling programs were:

- There was frequent consultation between the classroom teachers, administrators and counselors.
- Contacts between the counselor and the parents of the student were frequent.
- After diagnosing the student's learning problems, provision was made for follow-up activities. Thus, the counseling and psychological staff assisted the school in placement of the student, then followed his progress in the compensatory education program.

Inservice Training. An important element in the strengthening of instructional programs for disadvantaged youth is an effective inservice training program for personnel in compensatory education activities. In the first year of Title I, the emphasis of inservice training projects was

on improving the attitudes of school personnel toward disadvantaged children. During the 1966-67 school year, there was a significant shift from understanding the problems of the disadvantaged to the development of specific skills to meet the needs of disadvantaged students. There was also an increase in the number of inservice training projects concentrating on improving skills in diagnosing educational and learning deficiences and on development of new curriculum materials. Very little inservice training was directed specifically at improving skills in guidance and counseling.

Elementary school teachers comprised more than two-thirds of the participants in training activities, while about one-fourth were secondary teachers. Only a small percentage of the participants were administrators or non-certificated personnel, such as teacher aides.

Although the types and intensity of inservice training activities varied considerably, the most promising inservice projects were characterized by the following factors:

- The goals of the inservice program were clearly defined and a concentrated effort was made to improve instruction in a specific area.
- The inservice program included all the professional and para-professional staff whose acquisition of new knowledge or a specific skill would affect the behavior or achievement of disadvantaged students.
- Districts used a workshop approach with an organizational structure which provided for small group interaction.
- Skills were developed or modified over an extended period of time during the regular school year.

- The attitude change or new skill advocated during the inservice program was implemented and modified under local classroom conditions with local students.
- The organizational system included routinely scheduled periodic group meetings of participants for discussion, evaluation and modification of new techniques and materials advocated during the initial phases of the training program.

Least effective were inservice training programs that consisted of one all day meeting for the school year. It was usually a large group meeting with a formal speaker, and did not provide opportunities for individual participants to actually use new techniques or materials with disadvantaged students.

Teacher Aides. Teachers and administrators gave high praise to the value of non-certificated teacher aides in compensatory education activities. The aides were hired to reduce pupil-adult ratio, provide assistance and service to certificated personnel, allow the teacher time for special attention to individual students and serve as liaison between school and home.

Assignments for teacher aides varied widely. The activities most frequently performed by aides were preparation of instructional materials, working with individual students and small groups, supervising class work and group games, correcting papers and performing clerical duties. In addition to using aides for classroom teachers, many districts employed aides to reading specialists, community workers, nurses, counselors, librarians and other personnel.

Teacher aides were most successful in projects where:

- The aides, along with the classroom teachers, received inservice training to familiarize them with the nature and purposes of the compensatory education program.
- The duties of the aides were clearly delineated.
- Bilingual aides were used in schools with large numbers of non-English speaking students.
- The aides were recruited from the target area population.

English as a Second Language (ESL). English programs for non-English speaking students were concentrated in three areas of the state: the southern counties adjacent to the Mexican border, the San Joaquin Valley agricultural area and the large cities.

Most of the ESL projects were conducted in special classrooms by bilingual teachers with the assistance of bilingual aides. Resource teachers were often employed to prepare materials for the teachers and students. Most of the programs relied on new and often experimental materials. Evaluation data indicated that the students' reading comprehension, ability to express ideas in English clearly and confidence in speaking increased as a result of ESL activities.

The most successful ESL projects were those which included extensive involvement of parents and community resource persons in the activities. At the secondary level, an effective technique was to relate the use of English skills to vocational training programs.

Preschool. An analysis of test data indicated that kindergarten children who had attended preschool scored substantially higher on reading readiness tests than did disadvantaged children who had not gone to pre-

school. The preschool programs were particularly helpful to youngsters from homes where English is not the primary language. The preschool children also scored higher on intelligence tests after participation in preschool activities.

Other evaluation devices, such as teacher rating scales, indicated that the preschool children made appreciable progress in language and cognitive development. Their emotional maturity and behavior, especially in working cooperatively with other children, generally improved.

Strong emphasis was placed in preschool programs on involvement of parents as volunteers and aides in the classroom and as participants in activities.

Integration. Title I funds were used by several school districts to implement integration plans designed to alleviate the adverse effects of racial isolation on minority group students.

The general pattern for integration was to reassign minority group students from heavily impacted target area schools to elementary schools which had small percentages of ethnic minority pupils and adequate classroom space. Where necessary, transportation was provided to the "receiving" schools. Some of the Title I services and personnel normally provided in the poverty area schools followed the integrated pupils to their new schools. These included language and remedial reading specialists, cultural enrichment, home-school coordinators, human relations specialists, free lunch programs and after-school study centers. In most of the districts, 1966-67 was the first year of their integration program.

Data submitted by the school districts indicated that the integrated students progressed at a slightly augmented rate of achievement, as compared

to their previous growth, while the achievement of the "resident" students in the receiving schools was not affected. Where studies were conducted to compare the achievement of integrated students with that of students who had similar pre-test scores but who remained in the poverty area schools, the integrated pupils made similar or slightly higher scores.

Teachers reported that the integrated pupils had shown improvement in attitude toward school, interest in learning, self-image and general appearance during the year. The majority of parents expressed the opinion that their children were getting a better education because of the integration program.

From the data available at this time, it appears that integration has had a positive effect on the minority children involved. There is evidence to suggest that the effect has been greatest on the higher achieving groups within the target area population.

Other implications of the data are:

- Integrated children seem to achieve higher when they are grouped with high achieving, academically-oriented pupils from the receiving schools.
- Clustering the integrated students from the target area in a single class or with low-achieving pupils results in continued poor achievement.
- Integration with motivated pupils results in improved performance on ability tests, even after a short time.

Health Services. Through Title I, disadvantaged students in poverty areas received physical and dental examinations, nutrition in the form of free breakfasts, lunches or snacks, and instruction in proper health habits.

Most of the health services programs were conducted by school nurses, who identified children to be referred to doctors and dentists for correction of medical and dental problems, including visual and auditory handicaps.

Parents, as well as students, received health education instruction in nutrition, personal care, immunization and disease control. The nurses often served as the school-home liaison person, providing families with medical advice and information, gathering information on the reasons for student absences and relaying information from the school to home.

The health services resulted in identification of many health problems which were affecting student progress in school. Health services also resulted in an increase in parent involvement in school activities.

Cultural Enrichment. Cultural enrichment activities were most effective when they were planned around classroom teaching units. In most cases, cultural enrichment was in the form of study trips, which were preceded by classroom preparation so that the students gained an understanding and appreciation of what they would see. The study trips were followed up with discussions, written reports and other activities centered around the experiences of the students.

Trips were conducted to governmental agencies, business firms, community centers, institutions of higher education, parks and recreation areas, and fine arts performances. In many districts parents were encouraged to accompany their children on study trips, often as chaperones.

Teachers reported that study trips were of value both as a teaching tool and as a means of broadening the cultural background of the students. These activities also helped improve the students' conceptual and verbal skills.

PROGRESS RATINGS

Each project was rated by the Office of Compensatory Education on a four point scale as to its degree of success in meeting its objectives. The four ratings were "substantial progress," "moderate progress," "some progress," and "little or no progress or progress not specified."

Rigorous standards were applied in judging the degree of success. To receive a rating of "substantial progress," a project had to result in substantial growth or positive change that was greater than would have been expected in the regular school program and that was statistically significant, meaning the obtained results could not have occurred by chance. A control or comparison group had to be used to show that the positive growth or change was due to the Title I project.

For a project to receive a "moderate progress" rating, there also had to be substantial and significant growth or positive change. There was no control or comparison group, usually because none was available, but the magnitude of change was such that the same result would not have been expected from the regular school program.

Projects receiving a "some progress" rating had data to show growth or positive change, although the magnitude of the growth or change was not sufficient to justify a higher rating.

The "little or no progress or progress not specified" rating was applied to projects which did not result in positive change or where growth was not specified. This included cases where the school officials stated that their project was effective or successful but submitted no supporting information.

The percentage of projects, categorized by their primary activity, receiving each rating in 1965-66 and 1966-67, is presented in Table E. It should be noted that the percentages of projects receiving each rating do not necessarily reflect the percentages of students participating in the projects. On the average, the projects that were more successful and received higher ratings were in the larger districts and involved larger numbers of students,while the projects with lower ratings tended to be in the smaller districts. For example, the 44.6 percent of the remedial reading projects which received a "substantial" or "moderate progress" rating represented more than two-thirds of the Title I students participating in reading activities.

A comparison of the two years shows an increase in the percentage of 1966-67 projects that were effective in meeting their objectives. In 1966-67, 44.3 percent of the total projects received a "substantial progress" or "moderate progress" rating, as compared to 33.7 percent in 1965-66. There was a corresponding decrease in the percentage of projects receiving lower ratings. About 85 percent of the projects in 1966-67 resulted in demonstrated growth or positive change to some degree.

MIGRANT EDUCATION

Through 1966 amendments to Title I, the California Plan for the Education of Migrant Children was developed and implemented in the spring of 1967. The program constituted California's first statewide effort to strengthen educational opportunities for children of migrant agricultural workers. Some 9,671 children participated in projects in 66 school districts in 21 counties.

TABLE E

PROGRESS REPORT ON PRIMARY ACTIVITIES CONDUCTED
BY CALIFORNIA SCHOOL DISTRICTS
1965-66 and 1966-67

	Substantial Progress	Moderate Progress	Some Progress	Little or No Specified Prog.	Number of Projects
	% of Proj.	% of Proj.	% of Proj.	% of Proj.	
Preschool					
1965-66	3.9	31.4	33.3	31.4	51
1966-67	5.0	45.0	35.0	15.0	42
Curriculum Programs -- Total					
1965-66	2.6	35.7	45.2	16.5	611
1966-67	9.0	37.2	39.9	13.9	621
Curriculum Program -- Communicative Skills					
1965-66	2.6	36.8	46.5	14.0	114
1966-67	9.3	45.9	31.4	3.1	169
Curriculum Program -- Remedial Reading					
1965-66	2.4	38.0	46.2	13.3	368
1966-67	9.2	35.4	43.9	11.7	326
Curriculum Program -- English as a Second Language					
1965-66	2.3	27.9	44.1	25.6	26
1966-67	3.2	29.0	48.4	19.4	31
Supportive Auxiliary Services					
1965-66	3.7	15.7	36.1	44.5	108
1966-67	9.4	18.8	37.6	32.9	52
Guidance and Counseling					
1965-66	-	30.0	33.8	36.2	80
1966-67	12.3	28.1	45.6	14.0	57

TABLE E (Cont.)

	Substantial Progress	Moderate Progress	Some Progress	Little or No Specified Prog.	Number of Projects
	% of Proj.	% of Proj.	% of Proj.	% of Projects	
Health Services					
1965-66	6.6	46.7	26.7	20.0	15
1966-67	11.1	11.1	44.5	33.3	18
School-Community Coordination					
1965-66	-	70.0	23.3	6.7	30
1966-67	6.7	33.3	33.3	26.7	15
Cultural Enrichment					
1965-66	3.8	21.8	47.4	27.0	133
1966-67	7.5	36.4	36.4	19.7	66
Reduction of Teacher Load					
1965-66	-	32.3	43.4	24.3	99
1966-67	6.0	37.4	32.5	24.1	83
Dropout Projects					
1965-66	-	80.0	-	20.0	5
1966-67	20.0	20.0	20.0	40.0	5
Study Centers and Tutoring Projects					
1965-66	3.8	22.6	43.4	30.2	53
1966-67	10.4	31.0	27.6	31.0	29
Inservice Education					
1965-66	-	16.4	24.7	58.9	73
1966-67	17.1	48.6	25.7	8.6	35
Attitude Development					
1965-66	-	41.7	45.8	12.5	24
1966-67	3.7	25.9	55.6	14.8	27
TOTAL					
1965-66	2.3	31.4	41.2	25.1	1,282
1966-67	9.0	35.3	38.8	16.9	1,050

A major feature of the migrant program was the development of a multi-district and multi-agency approach to the education of migratory children. Regional and countywide projects were implemented to demonstrate the advantages of coordinated efforts involving funds and resources of several agencies.

As most of the migrant children were Mexican-Americans with limited command of the English language, the instructional program placed strong emphasis on language development and English as a Second Language. Pupil-adult ratios were substantially reduced to provide individualized and small group instruction. In the majority of cases, this objective was accomplished through use of teacher assistants and teacher aides, many of whom were bilingual and were former migrants.

Aides were also used to provide direct contact with parents of migrant children. Involvement of parents was an important part of all the migrant projects. In addition to being employed as aides, they served as members of school district advisory committees to plan and implement programs and participated in activities designed specifically to improve their understanding of the importance of education.

Other major activities for migrant children included preschool, cultural enrichment, health and food services, physical education and recreation, and after school study centers. A primary goal of the California Plan for the Education of Migrant Children was full integration of the children into the mainstream of school activities. Whenever it was physically possible, migrant children were integrated into regular classrooms rather than placed in separate classrooms or schools. The result of integration was that the migrant children gained rapidly in acculturation and language development because of increased contact with their

non-migrant classmates.

The California Plan for the Education of Migrant Children included interstate cooperation with Arizona, Oregon, Texas and Washington. The five states participated in exchange of teachers, inservice education of migrant education staff personnel, transfer of student school and health records, and exchange of information on effective techniques in educating migrant children.

PROBLEM AREAS

Major problem areas in implementation of Title I programs in California were the reduction in appropriation and delay in funding, lack of adequate personnel and, in some cases, misunderstanding of the purpose of Title I.

Reduction in Appropriation and Delay in Funding. The reduction of California's Title I appropriation from the 1965-66 level created serious problems in maintaining the quality of the programs.

The problems caused by reduced funding could be successfully resolved only through a restoration of funds; however, steps were taken by the State Office of Compensatory Education and school districts to alleviate the effects of the cutback. Districts generally adopted one of three alternatives: reduced the number of children served; continued some of the previous year's Title I activities with other resources, such as district funds; or eliminated or reduced some procedures, such as equipment purchases, and concentrated funds on personnel and services.

Late Congressional action in appropriating funds for Title I compounded the program planning and implementation problems caused by the

cutback in funds. For maximum efficiency in use of resources, school districts must know the amount they have available from Title I in the spring of the previous school year. Late funding also had an adverse effect on employment of qualified personnel for Title I activities as recruitment is generally conducted during the spring and early summer.

The problems caused by late funding were partially alleviated by the State Office of Compensatory Education's policy allowing school districts to apply and receive approval for 85 percent of their previous year's allocation amount, pending official action by Congress. This allowed school districts to begin implementing their Title I program prior to notification of their actual allocation. However, some of the districts, particularly the smaller ones, postponed implementation of their 1966-67 projects until they received official notification of their entitlement. Consequently, many projects were not in operation for the full school year. In addition to earlier Congressional action on appropriations, funding over a longer period of time is needed to reduce uncertainty of allocations and to promote more efficient long range planning.

Lack of Personnel. The inadequate supply of qualified personnel, especially specialists such as reading teachers and school-community liaison workers, continued to be a major problem during the 1966-67 school year. School districts generally attempted to resolve their personnel problems by special training for existing employees and by extensive use of paraprofessionals, especially teacher and clerical aides.

Many smaller districts also had insufficient personnel with the background and knowledge to plan, implement and evaluate compensatory education programs. Use of county office personnel, contracts with outside

consultants, development of cooperative projects and assistance from the State Office of Compensatory Education helped alleviate the problem.

More intensified inservice training for all staff personnel in compensatory education is needed. School district reports indicated that few administrators or teacher aides were receiving inservice training. There was also evidence that many teachers in compensatory education schools were not aware of the purposes of the specialized programs for disadvantaged children.

Misunderstanding of Title I Philosophy. A major problem during the 1965-66 school year was that many school districts misunderstood the concept of the program and sought approval for general aid programs rather than activities concentrating on the needs of the most disadvantaged children. Great progress has been made in this area and the problem was substantially reduced during the 1966-67 school year, as the concept of compensatory education for disadvantaged children gained understanding and acceptance.

However, the problem still exists in some school districts, which continue to submit applications that would spread the funds too thinly over a poorly defined target area. Because funds are insufficient to enable all children in need of compensatory education to receive services, it is necessary to focus activities on the learning handicaps of the most severely disadvantaged students.

C7-87--Preliminary 1-68 750